

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Final Office Action mailed July 12, 2007. Claims 19-41 are currently pending in the subject application. Claims 19, 29, 37, 39 and 41 have been amended. Support for all amended claims can be found in the specification, and no new matter has been added by these amendments. Reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Examiner Interview

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the telephone conference between the Examiner and Applicant's representative on September 11, 2007, during which certain differences between proposed claims and the cited references were discussed.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action rejected claims 19-23, 25, 26, 29, 30 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,914,719 issued to *Herz*. Without conceding the merits of the rejection, Applicant respectfully submits that the amended claims overcome this rejection.

Claim 19, as amended, recites in part "delimiting the first data format component of the multimedia signal from a beginning of the identified occurrence of the search parameter to an end of the identified occurrence of the search parameter." Claim 19 also recites "determining a portion of the second data format component of the multimedia signal that corresponds to the delimited first data format component of the multimedia signal." Claim 19 further recites "synchronizing a first segment and a second segment of the multimedia signal." In one feature, "the first segment includes the occurrence of the search parameter in the first data format component of the multimedia signal and the second segment includes the portion of the second data format component of the multimedia signal that corresponds to the delimited first data format component."

Amdt. dated September 12, 2007

Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure

Examining Group 2623

In contrast, *Herz* teaches a host processor that displays a request for search terms. The host processor receives the user selected search term, and then scans text records for records matching the search terms. (Column 5, lines 22-26).

In contrast, as recited in claim 1, a multimedia signal is delimited at an occurrence of a search parameter. Two different data format segments of the multimedia signal are synchronized. One segment includes the occurrence of the search parameter and the other segment corresponds to the delimited portion of the multimedia signal. This is different than scanning text records for a user selected search term.

Neither *Herz* nor any of the other cited references, alone or in combination, teach all of the features recited in independent claim 19. Specifically, *Herz* does not teach "delimiting the first data format component of the multimedia signal from a beginning of the identified occurrence of the search parameter to an end of the identified occurrence of the search parameter." *Herz* also does not teach "determining a portion of the second data format component of the multimedia signal that corresponds to the delimited first data format component of the multimedia signal." *Herz* further does not teach "synchronizing a first segment and a second segment of the multimedia signal, wherein the first segment includes the occurrence of the search parameter in the first data format component of the multimedia signal and the second segment includes the portion of the second data format component of the multimedia signal that corresponds to the delimited first data format component." For at least this reason, claim 19 is allowable over the cited art, as are claims 20-23, 25 and 26, which depend from claim 19.

Independent claim 29 recites features that are similar to the features recited in amended claim 19. As discussed above with reference to claim 19, the cited art does not teach these features. Thus, claim 29 is also allowable over the cited art for at least the same reasons. Claims 30 and 32 depend from allowable claim 29 and derive patentability therefrom.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 19-23, 25, 26, 29, 30 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected claims 24, 31, 37, 40 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Herz*. The Office Action also rejected claims 27, 28, 33-36, 38 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Herz* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,809,471 issued to *Brodsky*. Without conceding the merits of the rejection, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is overcome.

Claim 37, as amended, recites in part "delimiting the first component of the multimedia signal from a beginning of the occurrence of the search parameter to an end of the occurrence of the search parameter." Claim 37 also recites "determining a portion of the second component of the multimedia signal that corresponds to the delimited first component."

As discussed above with reference to claim 19, *Herz* teaches a host processor that displays a request for search terms, receives the user selected search term, and then scans text records for records matching the search terms.

Neither *Herz* nor any of the other cited references, alone or in combination, teach all of the features recited in independent claim 37. Specifically, *Herz* does not teach "delimiting the first component of the multimedia signal from a beginning of the occurrence of the search parameter to an end of the occurrence of the search parameter; and determining a portion of the second component of the multimedia signal that corresponds to the delimited first component." For at least this reason, claim 37 is allowable over the cited art, as are claims 38-41, which depend from claim 37.

Claims 27 and 28 depend from claim 19 (either directly or indirectly), claims 33-36 depend from claim 29 (either directly or indirectly), and claims 38 and 39 depend from claim 37. The rejection of claims 27, 28, 33-36, 38 and 39 is premised on the assertion that *Herz* discloses the features recited in claims 19, 29 and 37, and *Brodsky* discloses the remaining features of claims 27, 28, 33-36, 38 and 39.

As discussed above, however, *Herz* does not disclose or suggest all features recited in claims 19, 29 and 37. As best understood, *Brodsky* does not provide any teaching or

Appl. No. 09/841,327
Amdt. dated September 12, 2007
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure
Examining Group 2623

PATENT

suggestion that would remedy this deficiency. Therefore, the rejection cannot be maintained. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 27, 28, 33-36, 38 and 39.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 24, 27, 28, 31 and 33-41 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 206-467-9600.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9/12/07



John J. Farrell
Reg. No. 57,291

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 206-467-9600
Fax: 415-576-0300
JJF:jae
61150234 v1